

tion 21) of revising arrangements, which power can be exercised within a limit of five years from the date of the final notification. It is obvious that no case of hardship could escape the embrace of such ample provisions.

## SECTION IX.—APPEALS FROM SETTLEMENT ORDERS.

It will be observed that *all* orders passed by the Forest Settlement Officer regarding the definition, regulation or commutation of rights, as well as orders regarding claims to land inside the proposed forest, are open to appeal.

The appeal may proceed from the right-holder or claimant, or be on behalf of the forest-owner—the Government; in which latter case they are to be lodged by any person “generally or specially empowered in that behalf” by the Government (Act, section 16). In the Burma Act (section 16) this provision has been omitted. It was thought sufficient to let the appeal be only on behalf of the claimant. If the Government forest officer sees anything wrong, it is sufficient that he make the necessary official reference and the power of revision vested with Chief Commissioner will enable him to correct any errors.

Three months is the limit for appealing.

Appeals must be in writing and are to be delivered to the Forest Settlement Officer who forwards them. The appellate authority is a Revenue Officer especially appointed, of rank not below a Collector or Deputy Commissioner.

The appeals are subject to the same procedure as ordinary revenue appeals.

A special Forest Court may (under the Indian Act) be appointed to hear appeals; but this provision has not as yet been acted on.

Such a Court would only be necessary in cases of special complication and difficulty, and the appeal is then to be heard somewhere near the forest, so as to admit of local investigation if necessary.